



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,764	10/20/2003	Byung-Ryul Ryoo	1293.1910	8966
21171	7590	05/31/2007	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			GOMA, TAWFIK A	
SUITE 700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			2627	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<i>Office Action Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/687,764	RYOO ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Tawfik Goma	2627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 October 2003 and 24 January 2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/14/2007.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the amendment filed on 2/23/2007.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 3/14/2007 includes a reference to a Chinese Patent Document (CN 1170882A) and a second office action issued in Chinese that corresponds to Chinese application 200310102615.7 which fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent and NPL listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein (CN 1170882A and Chinese Office Action) has not been considered.

Drawings

The drawings were received on 1/24/2007. These drawings are acknowledged and entered. The objection to the drawings is withdrawn.

Specification

The amendments to the specification filed on 1/24/2007 are acknowledged and entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Komma et al (US 5644413), herein Komma.

Regarding claim 1, Komma discloses an optical pickup apparatus comprising: a light source which emits laser light (45, fig. 19); a beam splitter which changes the travel path of incident light (48, fig. 19); an objective lens which condenses light passed through the beam splitter to form a light spot on an optical recording medium (50, fig. 19); and a photo detector which receives light reflected from the optical recording medium and then passed through the beam splitter to detect an information signal and an error signal (53, fig. 19), wherein the optical pickup apparatus further comprises a grating which diffraction-transmits all incident light (94, fig. 20), a wavelength plate which changes polarization characteristic of incident light (95, fig. 20), and an optical output compensating lens which compensates output of light incident from the light source (100, fig. 20), all of which being disposed on an optical path between the light source and the beam splitter (99, fig. 19), wherein at least two of the grating, the wavelength plate, and the optical output compensating lens are formed in one body (99, figs. 19 and 20).

Regarding claim 2, Komma further discloses wherein the grating is formed on an optical incident surface and/or an optical emitting surface of the wavelength plate, so that the grating and the wavelength plate are formed in one body (99, fig. 19).

Regarding claim 3, Komma further discloses wherein the wavelength plate, which is formed in one body with the grating, is bonded to the optical output compensating lens (99, fig. 20).

Regarding claim 4, Komma further discloses wherein the grating is formed on an optical incident surface and/or an optical emitting surface of the optical output compensating lens, so that the grating and the optical output compensating lens are formed in one body (94, 100, 99, fig.20).

Regarding claim 5, Komma further discloses wherein the wavelength plate and the optical output compensating lens are bonded to each other (95, 100, fig. 20).

Regarding claim 7, Komma further discloses wherein the grating is formed on an optical incident surface of the wavelength plate, so that the grating and the wavelength plate are formed in one body (94, 95, fig. 20).

Regarding claim 8, Komma further discloses wherein the wavelength plate, which is formed in one body with the grating, is bonded to the optical output compensating lens (95, 100, fig. 20).

Regarding claim 11, Komma further discloses wherein the grating is formed on an optical incident surface of the optical output compensating lens, so that the grating and the optical output compensating lens are formed in one body (94, 100, fig. 20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komma et al (5644413) in view of Park et al (US 2003/0053394).

Regarding claims 6 and 13-16, Komma discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claims 1-5). Komma fails to disclose a holder in which the light source is fixed; and a cylinder, in which at least two of the grating, the wavelength plate, and the optical output compensating lens are fixed and which is movable in an optical axis direction with respect to the holder and is installed rotatably, wherein a position of the cylinder is adjustable in the optical axis direction and a rotation direction with respect to the holder. In the same field of endeavor, Park discloses a cylinder (70, fig. 10) supporting optical elements including a grating (45, fig. 10) and which is capable of supporting the elements to be rotatable about an optical axis and adjustable in an optical axis direction (pars. 63 and 64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the optical pickup disclosed by Komma by providing for a cylinder for rotating and moving the optical element as taught by Park. The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to provide the rotatable and movable support in order to adjust parameters of an optical axis for multiple types of disks used with a single pickup (see Park, par. 70).

Claims 9, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Komma et al (US 5644413).

Regarding claims 9, 10 and 12 Komma discloses all of the components of the optical element and their alternative arrangement as applied above (see claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 11). Claims 9, 10 and 12 are directed to a rearrangement of the optical elements disclosed by Komma. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the optical element disclosed by Komma by rearranging the optical elements.

The claims are deemed an obvious rearrangement that does not change the scope of the overall invention (see MPEP 2144.04 Paragraph VI (C)).

In re JAPIKSE
(CCPA)
86 USPQ 70
Decided May 9, 1950
Appl. No. 5634

U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals

In the brief of the Solicitor for the Patent Office it is pointed out that the claim reads on Cannon except as to the final limitation reading "means disposed in alignment with said opening for contact by said depending means to start the pressing operation of said hydraulic press." As to that limitation it was held that there would be no invention in shifting the starting switch disclosed by Cannon to a different position since the operation of the device would not thereby be modified.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 1/24/2007 have been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant's argues that since Komma et al does not diffract the second linearly polarized light (Y polarized) and only transmits the Y polarized light, Komma does not "diffraction-transmit all incident light" as claimed. This argument is not persuasive because the Y polarized light is not incident light but is rather return light reflected from the disk (see Komma col. 27 lines 2-12). Komma does in fact diffraction transmit all incident light, that is all light that is outgoing from the laser and incident on the surface of the grating. Applicant's disclosure only shows that the grating diffraction transmits incoming light from a laser, and does not disclose diffraction light that is returning from being reflected from a disc. Therefore, the term "incident light" is only limited to light that is incident through a laser source side of the grating, and as such Komma discloses a grating that diffraction transmits all incident light.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tawfik Goma whose telephone number is (571) 272-4206. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on (571) 272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

T. Goma
/Tawfik Goma/
5/17/2007

William Korzuch
WILLIAM KORZUCH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600